

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



W

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,265	02/02/2001	Mark A. Christopherson	P-9126.00	9662
27581 75	590 12/06/2002			
MEDTRONIC, INC.		EXAMINER		
MS-LC340	NIC PARKWAY NE		WINAKUR, ERIC FRANK  ART UNIT  FÄPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55432-5604			
			3736	1
			DATE MAILED: 12/06/2002	,
				į

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

<del></del>		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action		•	CHRISTOPHERSON ET AL:			
		09/776,265	Art Unit			
		Examiner  David J McCrosky	3736			
	Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	·				
			•			
Theref final re conditi	EPLY FILED 19 November 2002 FAILS TO PLAG ore, further action by the applicant is required to a jection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (* on for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe- nation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in			
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) 🔀 b) 🗀	· · · · · —	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.			
nave bee 37 CFR (b) above	ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da n filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten- 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened e, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo atent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:						
3. 🔲 🗸	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	tion(s):				
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
	5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
	Claim(s) allowed:					
	Claim(s) objected to:					
	Claim(s) rejected:					
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. 🔲 .	B. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. 🔲 1	P. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10.	Other:	•	5			
			Eric F Winakur Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3736			





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Krichen is restricted to situations where an implanted medical device "dumps" its information to a programmer (column 1, lines 46 - 53) and that this type of data transfer is not compatible with Halperin. However, this portion of Krichen is actually describing a deficiency of the prior art, which the Krichen system overcomes. Thus, Applicant's argument is based upon a misunderstanding of the teaching of the Krichen reference. Further, Applicant suggests that Examiner "fails to grasp the limited focus of Krichen", generalizes what Krichen contemplates, and attempts hindsight reconstruction of the claimed subject matter. However, a careful and thorough reading of the references indicates that Krichen teaches a type of data transfer that is compatible with Halperin and that the suggestion to combine comes from the references themselves. As a result, Applicant's arguments are not found to be persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J McCrosky whose telephone number is 703/305-1331. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric F. Winakur can be reached on 703/308-3940. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703/305-3590 for regular communications and 703/305-3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/308-0858.